

## Argument Analysis

Melissa Olivas

Dr. Sarah Lonelodge

Composition I

March 2, 2025

On the evening of October 26, 1984, audiences around the world would be captivated by the thrilling statement that was displayed across the screen of the film *The Terminator*. The fascinating statement read “The final battle would not be fought in the future. It would be fought here in our present. Tonight...” (*The Terminator*, 1984). A statement signaling the concern of how Artificial Intelligence will shape humanity, for better or worse? At the time AI was not a common household word, it was mostly spoken about within science fiction enthusiasts and never in politics. The 1980’s did not see major advances in AI since interest declined due to expectations not being met and the majority of the public did not know there were studies going on. So, humanity was still unaffected by the possible harm that could come from Artificial Intelligence and machines. Then for the next couple of decades, it would remain a background topic with not much argument on the effects it has on the public and especially on people’s daily lives. Entering the early 2000’s Artificial Intelligence would slowly start to get implemented into our daily lives, beginning with smart phones which brought about predictive texting that allowed people to text faster. Human machine interactions continued to get more involved while learning from each other. Later in 2024 for a PBS News Hour article, Paul Solman stated “As artificial intelligence rapidly advances, experts debate the level of threat to humans.” Where he addressed the rising concern, are the positive impacts worth the fear of AI’s continued growth?

The article published by Solman (2024) on August 23<sup>rd</sup> presented an unbiased position that mostly centered around what each expert in their field presented. The argument **presented a logical approach to** ~~being~~ whether humanity is doomed or is just part of human efficiency in the continued path to greatness. However, some fear the consequences of AI is more immediate than people realized like Eliezer Yudkowsky, the founder of the Machine Intelligence Research Institute, who strongly argues against the use of AI and its inevitable doom. **Yudkowsky’s**

rational argument is based on his specialized field. His conclusion based on the last 24 years of research from his nonprofit, he presents an emotional concern based on machine learning making AI faster and smarter every day. Possibly fearing the end of humanity in our lifetime. Solman supports his argument with many creditable people. Closely followed by others like artificial intelligence pioneer Geoffrey Hinton, also known as the Godfather of AI because he made significant contributions in the field of machine learning. As AI has improved in speech and image recognition. It has also eased people's everyday tasks and allows them to be more resourceful. Especially since this technology is becoming widely available to people worldwide. Although his experience with AI has been logical through computing experience yet he also sees the danger it can present. On the level of a global nuclear war, not just to the United States but for every other country. At its roots, AI is a program that is like any other model, it can be subject to the biases of the person writing the code or influencing its data points in order to affect its outcome. The article author's claim appears to be based on the logical approach to this dilemma if there is a possibility of being used against someone, group or country.

The power that AI can have is narrowed down to what it has access to and that is where I believe arguments have the most to discuss. As Stanford AI expert Jerry Kaplan states "That's created a whole mythology". Like The Terminator franchise which explores a world where AI and machines decide on the fate of humans. In his book "Generative Artificial Intelligence: What Everyone Needs to Know" Kaplan's argument claims that the implications come from what people do with this technology, not necessarily from what that technology will do to people, so it appears to be reasonable that technology is not really the issue. Since he states, "They don't want anything. They don't need anything." There is a threat to humanity at the digital hands of Artificial Intelligence because it will be from what someone programmed it to do. Bias outcomes

can happen if the training data that the program is provided favor one group over the other.

Although most people view the danger from emotional state because of the references to pop culture on the effects of AI on humanity. Solman is presented with the view of the threat being real and a definite possibility. That AI can be weaponized against humanity however transparency will play a crucial role in its future to be trusted amongst people. So, it will continue to be complex because it is a multilayered issue in the conversation about harm to humanity.

On one layer it appears that Solman's language begins to center more around the safety outcome of people rather than the other advancements AI has brought forward. The next layer step in this argument would be to ask a couple AI models what their analysis on human extinction is on a scale to ten. Where zero is no risk at all to ten being the total extinction of the human race. Solman asked the AI avatar of Reid Hoffman, founder of LinkedIn, it believes the number should be two to four. Based on the data points across many analytical references that it has used to learn. While the human Reid Hoffman believes it should be at one. Allowing the presumption that each AI program might have a different suggested outcome when presented the same question. In an opportunity Solman also interviewed Ameca which unlike everything prior, this AI has an Artificial Body which functions like in many ways like a human body. Ameca responded with a three on the scale or thirty percent. This informs the viewers that the number was based more on the handling of this powerful technology by the people and not necessarily artificial intelligence. That the hypothetical perceived threat analysis was constructed based on the analytical data stored on its servers, as a plausible probability grounded on prior events and a likelihood it will probably be caused by humans. However, the language does change to a more positive one with Ameca reassuring Solman about humanities resilience when faced with the

unbelievable situations. The argument ends up being challenged more by an AI program more than people. Although some people believe that more good can come from Artificial Intelligence including Chat GPTs creator Sam Altman.

Altman reasons that through accountability, AI can be used to solve more complex issues in different fields by maximizing the good. The data provided from fields where AI is being used to better results, like new drug **discoveries** as a co-scientist, disease diagnosis from MRIs and X-Rays. Likewise, the agriculture industry is applying AI to **crop yields in order to forecast** multipoint data and provide recommendations for improved **production**. Meanwhile the Automotive sector is using AI for many safety improvements like lane keeping, object detection around the vehicle, anticollision sensing and overall safety to the passengers. While retail is using AI to provide a bespoke or personalized approach to people's lives. Allowing people the ability of not having to navigate the items they normally do not purchase. Furthermore, finance is also seeing major improvements like risk assessment, trading, improved processes and fraud detection. People will continue to see the use of AI models be applied to their daily lives even more and maybe not directly. It can also allow people to communicate easier since AI models are becoming faster like GPT-3 which uses 175 billion parameters as its language processing model.

Although the article **seems biased** towards the threat being more imminent, it does provide many perspectives from people **across different levels of expertise** and AI **alike**. Both sides can argue each point very well because of the amount of short-term data available. So it will take more time with more case studies in controlled environments and real world use to fully understand the threat level. **The fallacy that the end of humanity will come at the digital hands of Artificial Intelligence derives from our own imaginations in writings, screenplays, culture and even comic books. So that aspect affects people on an emotion level and the majority of all**

conclusions are based on the logical evaluation of data alone. Since AI models have not achieved self-opinions on their observed daily interactions. The tone throughout the article from Solman seems hopeful about humanity's continued existence and still shows interest in knowing more about the uses of AI. It is an informative article about the current conversation around Artificial Intelligence, that the viewers can find to be beneficial. While providing the viewer with a reassurance that there is a threat, however not in the near future, from AI but from the people behind the scenes. Whether it is in our lifetime or not, the question remains in the dark.

## References

<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/as-artificial-intelligence-rapidly-advances-experts-debate-level-of-threat-to-humanity>

[https://www.google.com/books/edition/Generative\\_Artificial\\_Intelligence/rsU6EQAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover](https://www.google.com/books/edition/Generative_Artificial_Intelligence/rsU6EQAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&printsec=frontcover)

<https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0088247/>